

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 5996  
**APPLICANT NAME:** Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Napa-Berryessa Integrated Regional Water Management  
  
**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$ 49,975,000  
**COST MATCH:** \$ 52,924,500  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$102,899,500

**DESCRIPTION:** Each of the twelve projects included in the proposal work toward achieving one or more of these goals. For instance, additional recycled water will lessen the strain on the tight water supply in the Region. Using local supplies more effectively, such as integrating recycled water into the local water supply, will decrease the dependence on State Water Project water. Increasing water recycling efforts will assist with objectives of reduced or zero effluent discharges to the Napa River, which will help meet expected TMDLs for nutrients and pathogens. Utilizing recycled water for irrigation will reduce groundwater pumping rates, restore groundwater levels, and thus increase natural inflows to local waterways.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 2

The applicant submitted an agenda item showing that the FED would be adopted on July 19, 2005 by Napa Valley Flood Control and Water Conservation District. A LOMU that was signed by all of the IRWMP participants was submitted with the application. Otherwise, no formal adoption was received.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The applicant provided a well-structured discussion of their region and seems to have a very good grasp of what affects water quality. They provided very good detail in most areas, but failed to properly describe why the region is appropriate except that it is the boundaries of the applicant. The region is located in two separate RWBs, which would likely mean that there is a watershed split within the region. They did not properly address the current and future water supply demand for the region, but referenced multiple supporting documents that likely contain the material. The proposal's region coincides with Napa County boundaries and overlaps the region shown for the 2 other applications.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The applicant provided a good list of objectives, but did not provide any discussion regarding the manner in which the objectives were determined. The objectives appear to address the most significant water related conflicts in the region. Conflicts in the region could be resolved by better regional coordination.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The applicant provides a detailed list of water management strategies associated with regional issues. These strategies work together to provide reliable water supplies, protect and improve water quality, and achieve other objectives in the region. This type of integration is reflected in the adopted planning/strategic documents that comprise the FED and provide many benefits to the region's water resources. A discussion of the strategic aspects of the planning documents and the benefits of applying those strategies to the region are included. Benefits of integrating multiple water management strategies include improving coordination between regional agencies and organizations, achieving efficient and effectively managed projects, and providing water quality and water supply benefits.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The applicant identified a number of integrated regional projects that should be pursued in order to effectively implement the FED. The initial project list is primarily based on project readiness, program preferences, statewide priorities, and water management elements. Projects were then prioritized based on the need for the project, the impact on water supply issues, impact on water quality, DAC status, and regional distribution. The RWMG recognize that the short- and long-term project lists are dynamic and will need to be re-evaluated on a periodic basis to ensure that the most critical regional needs are still being addressed. The applicant also states that the RWMG recognizes the importance of identifying the critical regional needs from a variety of perspectives and that it will continue to welcome new stakeholders to the group and actively outreach to them.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP states that all short-term projects are feasible and that studies and design reports have, for most projects, already been preformed. Table 11 provides a list of documents which support the FED. However, the FED does not cite any studies or plan designs included in the application. Institutional structure is demonstrated on a regional basis, by the Lead Agency, and on a local level, by members of the RWMG. How these two groups will interact is unclear. Project timeline and responsibility for implementation are located in the application, not in the FED. The reviewers could not locate a discussion regarding project linkage.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The potential for negative impacts from the IRWM projects is discussed. The applicant states that most projects will need to undergo the CEQA and/or NEPA process. The advantages of collaboration instead of individual efforts are presented as increased efficiency and effectively managed projects with region-wide benefits. Interregional benefits are presented in a bulleted fashion. The only discussion of DACs in this section is presented in the bulleted item "Improving water supplies for downstream disadvantaged communities." It is unclear what this means and whether the FED will address DACs in the region. While other resources are listed in the application, impacts to these resources are not discussed.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant included Table 13, which discussed each planning document in relation to the data and analysis that it supplied, but it did not link the documents to water management strategies. They did not discuss data gaps. They attempted to address the measures that will be used to evaluate the projects, but more specifics for the projects would have been helpful. It would have been appropriate to have linked plan performance metrics with specific projects. Some general methodologies for adapting the plans at various stages in response to changing conditions were provided.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant refers to the venues that it will disseminate the data through to the public, but nothing appears to currently exist or be under development. The applicant will be the clearinghouse for data, and data will be disseminated through monthly reports, annual reports, web site postings, etc. The applicant did discuss the support of statewide data needs and referred to both the SWAMP and GAMA databases. However, SWAMP and GAMA integration is not discussed. Table 14 lists some current monitoring efforts, but not much detail is provided.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The applicant provided Table 15 that lists the "Instrumental Agencies." Attachment 7 lists the estimated amounts to be contributed by each agency. Page 12-2 lists the various types of funding mechanisms to support implementation and on-going support for O&M needs, but does not provide details into the funding sources listed.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The FED is based on the RWMG planning documents including UWMPs, GWMPs, water supply plans, and resources conservation plans. However, the FED fails to present either an adequate discussion regarding how the FED is coordinated with local land use agencies or discuss how these documents relate to the FED's water management strategies. Additionally, a discussion regarding the dynamics between the FED and local planning documents is not presented.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant states that non-agency stakeholders are involved in the planning of the projects, but was done during the development of the original planning documents that comprise the FED. An IRWM workgroup meets at least monthly to discuss the ongoing water management issues of the region. The applicant states that "The activities related to adoption of the IRWMP and the identification of projects is publicly noticed through agency meeting agenda, websites, and newsletters." Environmental Justice concerns are briefly discussed on pages 13-5 and 15-2. DACs are also briefly discussed on page 15-2. The applicant briefly addressed potential obstacles on page 15-2. The applicant discussed on coordination with State and federal agencies, but did not elaborate well on how the stakeholders are identified and how stakeholders can influence decision making.

### Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

### Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

The main goal of the projects is to increase water supply reliability. The proposal lists 12 projects that work towards achieving one or more of the goals. How these projects are consistent with the FED is not addressed. Each project provides a project description and discusses environmental and regional benefits and proposed mitigation and monitoring efforts. The description of monitoring could have been more detailed.

### Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The applicant has not formally adopted a project prioritization process. The projects proposed are considered ready to proceed, meet the funding criteria from the Guidelines, and meet regional objectives. However, the FED states that the Napa-Berryessa RWMG members will prioritize their list of projects based on the need for the project, the impact on water supply issues, impact on water quality, DAC status, and regional distribution.

### Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

It appears that costs are reasonable. The application includes proposal budgets by summary and task and budgets for individual projects. Proposal budget summary includes a 10% administration fee and 9% contingency fee. Proposal task budget and project budgets depict land cost, planning and design cost, construction cost, and funding match. Task budget show and "other" category which is entirely grant funded with a sum of \$30,000. It is unclear what this cost represents.

### Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The application includes a proposal and individual project schedules. Schedules include phases of specific projects; however, it is unclear if they are requesting funding for one or all phases. Proposal schedule depicts that all post-construction monitoring ends by year 2015.

### Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The Napa-Berryessa RWMG was formed to increase water supply reliability, protect and improve water quality, restore wildlife habitat, and manage groundwater resources. The 12 projects included in the proposal are necessary to achieve one or more of these goals. A discussion describing how each project meets the goals is unclear. Long-term needs are not addressed. Regional beneficial impacts are stated.

### Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The applicant discusses two DACs in the region that have less than 80% of the MHI for the County (not the State). The proposal could provide direct benefits to lower income areas in City of Calistoga and near Lake Berryessa. Further, a case is made describing the funding need for the two projects that would benefit these communities. However, these areas are only a small portion of the County/region population, and those projects have not been formally adopted as high priority projects. The direct benefits could be described better. The applicant is not requesting a funding match waiver.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The 12 projects provide multiple benefits. The ultimate goal is to increase water supply and improve water quality today and over the long-term. How these projects will work together to improve the basin is not addressed. Several projects will reduce pollutants into the Napa River. DACs will benefit from additional water supply and improved water quality.

TOTAL SCORE: 80